DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 222 026 EC 150 095

TITLE	California Master Plan for Special Education: 1980-81 Annual Evaluation Report. A Report to the State Board of Education, the Legislature, and the Governor, as Required by Education Code Section 56602.
INSTITUTION	California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento. Office of Program Evaluation and Research.
PUB DATE	82
NOTE	73p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Administrator Attitudes; *Disabilities; Elementary Secondary Education; *Individualized Education Programs; Parent Attitudes; *Program Evaluation; *School Districts; *Special Education; Student Attitudes; Student Placement; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

California's Master Plan for Special Education provides information on the extent and effectiveness of special education services for exceptional students in local plan areas (LPAs) for 1980-1981. Findings are grouped according to the following seven evaluation criteria (sample findings in parentheses): availability of special education services (an increase in LPAs from 21 to 42); correspondence with individualized education programs (students were taught in a variety of classroom settings with a variety of teaching techniques, although some high school students did not receive needed vocational education services); instruction in the least restrictive environment (students moved toward regular classrooms, and efforts to provide opportunities in regular school programs were generally successful); student changes as a result of special education (most made positive changes in seven aspects of growth and development); attitudes of parents, students, and school staff toward services (regular and special teachers in five LPAs knew about and appreciated each other's work, and resource specialists, administrators, and program specialists expressed positive attitudes); assistance to LPAs in program evaluation (extensive participation by school staff, parents, and students in LPA evaluations); and use of evaluation to improve programs (special LPAs made local decisions on staff allocation, emphases for staff development, transportation services, paperwork reduction, compliance actions, and program location based in part on information from local evaluation studies). Among six appendixes are lists of LPAs conducting evaluation studies and methods used by LPAs in evaluation studies. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED222026

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

0784

CALIFORNIA MASTER PLAN FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION

1980-81

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

A Report to the State Board of Education, the Legislature, and the Governor, as Required by Education Code Section 56602

CALIFORNIA STATE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Wilson Riles, Superintendent of Public Instruction
Sacramento, California
1982

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC 150095

This legislative report was prepared by the Office of Program Evaluation and Research, California State Department of Education, and was published by the Department, 721 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, CA 95814. Any questions regarding the report should be addressed to the Office of Program Evaluation and Research (telephone 916-322-5010).

Distributed under the provisions
of the Library Distribution Act

1982

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Executive Summary	1
Chapter	
Introduction to the 1980-81 Annual Evaluation Report on the California Master Plan for Special Education	6
I. What Was the Availability of Special Education Services to Students Under the California Master Plan for Special Education?	14
II. Did Students Receive Special Education Services According to Their Individualized Education Programs?	19
III. Were Handicapped Students Taught in Their Least Restrictive Environment?	23
IV. Did Students Change as a Result of Receiving Special Education Services?	27
V. Were the Attitudes of Parents, Students, and School Staff Favorable Toward the Special Education Services Provided?	31
VI. Were Special Education Local Plan Areas Assisted in Preparing to Evaluate Their Own Special Education Programs?	37
VII. Was Evaluation Used to Improve Special Education Programs?	43
Appendix A: List of Eighteen Established Special Education Local Plan Areas Conducting Evaluation Studies of Their Special Education Programs According to Their Own Evaluation Plans During 1980-81	49
Appendix B: List of Eight Evaluation Improvement Program Regional Centers Providing Technical Assistance in Program Evaluation for Special Education	49
Appendix C: California Legislation Requiring This Report	50
Appendix D: Methods Used by Special Education Local Plan Areas in 1980-81 in Their Evaluation Studies	51
Appendix E: OPER Review Document for Local Special Education Evaluation Plan, 1981-82	54
Appendix F: Local Evaluation Studies for 1981-82 in Five Topic Areas of Statewide Interest	57

CALIFORNIA MASTER PLAN FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION: 1980-81 ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The California Master Plan for Special Education is a comprehensive approach for providing special education services to individuals with exceptional needs in special education local plan areas (LPAs) formed by the more than 1,000 school districts and offices of county superintendents of schools.

During 1980-81, more than 200,000 children were receiving special education services in 21 established and 21 first-year implementer LPAs under the Master Plan, as authorized by SB 1870, Chapter 797 and Assembly Bill 3075, Chapter 1353, Statutes of 1980. The 42 LPAs included more than one-half of the school districts and offices of county superintendents of schools in California. This report is the seventh annual evaluation report of Master Plan programs.

The Department designed and carried out its 1980-81 evaluation plan to build upon the results of previous evaluations, to yield useful information, to reduce paperwork, to minimize duplication of effort, and to prepare for statewide implementation of Master Plan services in 97 LPAs in 1981-82. Emphasizing the use of evaluation at the local level to improve programs, the Department directed a major portion of its evaluation activities at increasing the capability of LPAs to evaluate their own programs. The Department held workshops for staff from established, first-year implementer, and planning LPAs. The workshops focused on designing feasible local evaluation plans containing evaluation studies which would answer local questions. At the same time the studies should contribute useful information to help form a statewide picture of the operation and effects of special education programs under the California Master Plan for Special Education. Although limited in their generalizability, the findings of these local evaluation studies hold interest both as possible indicators of trends over a period of time and as generators of ideas for future courses of action. The Department collected student information from all local special education programs. It should be noted that fiscal information will be reported in a separate volume.

For this report, the Department analyzed, interpreted, and summarized the child counts reported by the LPAs and results of locally designed evaluation studies conducted by eighteen special education LPAs in four broad topics of statewide interest: services according to individualized education programs, placement in least restrictive environment, student performance, and attitudes toward special education services. The Department also examined its previous evaluation reports. This 1980-81 annual evaluation report describes the evaluation efforts, the evaluation results, and the use of evaluation in improving Master Plan special education programs as California moved closer to the goal of a full educational opportunity for each child who needs special education services.

The answers to the Department's major evaluation questions are summarized as follows:

1. What Was the Availability of Special Education Services to Students Under the California Master Plan for Special Education?

   a. The number of special education local plan areas (LPAs) was increased from 21 LPAs in 1979-80 to 42 LPAs in 1980-81. One established single district LPA expanded to include the entire territory of the district under the Master Plan. (See pages 14 and 15.)

   b. A total of 210,805 students were receiving special education services in Master Plan programs in 42 LPAs on December 1, 1980, as compared to 102,275 students in 21 LPAs on December 1, 1979. (See page 15 and Table I-1.)

2. Did Students Receive Special Education Services According to Individualized Education Programs?

   a. As children's needs were identified, services were provided. A continual process of referral, assessment and instructional planning was conducted in cooperation with parents before students received special education services. The 21 established LPAs served more than 59,000 newly identified students in the twelve-month period between December 1, 1979, to December 1, 1980. Evaluation studies from seventeen LPAs contained information about services and IEPs. (See page 19.)

   b. Students were taught in a variety of classroom settings and with a variety of teaching techniques, according to studies from twelve LPAs. However, not all high school aged students received needed vocational education services. (See page 22.)

   c. Students' progress was noted, and their individualized education programs (IEPs) were revised to fit the changes in needs, according to studies in six LPAs. (See page 22.)

3. Were Handicapped Students Taught in Their Least Restrictive Environments?

   a. Decisions were made about the participation of each handicapped student in regular classrooms. In the 42 LPAs, 69.6 percent of the 210,805 special education students were enrolled in regular classes and received special education services on a part-time or pull-out basis. Of that total, 34.5 percent of the students were enrolled in regular classes and received designated instruction and services (DIS) such as speech and language instruction. The other 35.1 percent of the students were enrolled in regular classes and received resource specialist program services on a part-time basis. (See page 15 and Table I-1.)

   b. Students moved toward regular classes. Over a twelve-month period in the eighteen established LPAs whose geographical boundaries remained the same, about 17 percent of the students no longer needed special education services and were returned to regular education programs full time. In that same period, an additional

4 percent of the students moved to less restricted educational settings. Movement toward a less restrictive setting occurred in a similar proportion from all four special education instructional settings. (See page 16.)

c. Evaluation studies from twelve LPAs contained a variety of information about least restrictive environment. Handicapped students benefited from their participation in regular classes. According to parents and school staff in three LPAs, students were more confident and had more friends than in the past, brought assignments home, or looked for jobs for the first time. (See page 24.)

d. Nonhandicapped students in two LPAs indicated knowledge of the purpose of special education programs. (See page 24.)

e. Efforts to provide opportunities in regular school programs for handicapped students in special classes and special centers were generally successful, according to three LPAs' studies. However, some students experienced difficulty in keeping up with the workload in the regular class. (See page 24.)

f. The needs of regular classroom teachers for teaching their handicapped students received widespread attention. A study of staff development sponsored by the Department found statewide efforts and needs for both special education and regular education staff, particularly for coordinating existing resources and for follow-up assistance in schools and classrooms. In-service training was provided for regular class teachers as well as for special education staff and for administrators, as described in studies by eight LPAs. However, not all regular teachers had ready access to the individualized education programs of their special education students. (See page 25.)

4. Did Students Change as a Result of Receiving Special Education Services?

a. The results of evaluation studies conducted by ten LPAs indicated that most of the students in the studies made positive changes in seven aspects of growth and development, including personal development, participation in regular class, school conduct and participation in school activities, peer group relations, study habits and skills, academic achievement, and work habits and skills. Parents, as well as school staff, noticed positive changes in their children according to evaluation studies conducted by nine LPAs. As expected, not all students attained all the objectives in their individualized education programs, particularly at the high school level. (See page 28.)

b. Information about student progress came from reviews of student records, including IEPs; surveys and interviews of parents, school staff, and students; analyses of scores on standardized tests and of ratings of attainment of objectives; and studies of promotion to

higher grade levels and of students meeting graduation standard requirements. (See page 28.)

5. Were the Attitudes of Parents, Students, and School Staff Favorable Toward the Special Education Services Provided?

   a. Evaluation studies in eleven LPAs found generally favorable attitudes and widespread satisfaction. Parents were knowledgeable about special education programs and services and expressed general satisfaction, particularly about their child's progress, according to surveys and interviews in evaluation studies conducted by nine LPAs. Some parents wanted to know more about certain features such as community advisory committees and designated services and instruction. Urban parents were deeply interested in their children's education, according to an evaluation study by a metropolitan LPA. (See page 32 and Chart V-1.)

   b. Regular and special teachers in five LPAs knew about and appreciated each other's work. Regular teachers disliked the time and paperwork involved in individualized education program planning and meetings, but they were pleased at the results for children. (See page 34.)

   c. Program specialists who participated in school site visits, classroom observations, and student record reviews in five LPAs found much to commend. (See page 34.)

   d. In studies by seven LPAs, resource specialists described generally smooth operations in many elementary schools and they were working on improvements needed, such as career-vocational education opportunities for secondary school students. (See page 34.)

   e. In studies by seven LPAs, administrators pointed out specific examples of good teaching and expressed general satisfaction with special education programs. (See page 35.)

   f. In studies by four LPAs, students reported positive attitudes towards special education, such as decreases in labelling. Regular students referred themselves for special education services. Special students commented on their satisfaction at seeing their own improvement. (See page 35.)

6. Were Special Education Local Plan Areas Assisted in Preparing to Evaluate Their Own Special Education Programs?

   a. Eighteen established special education LPAs designed and conducted one or more evaluation studies on facets of their own special education programs according to their own tailor-made local evaluation plans. The Department assisted the LPAs in designing their evaluation studies. The findings from these local studies have been incorporated in this report. (See page 11 and Appendices A and D.)

b. There was extensive participation by school staff, parents, and students in the LPA's evaluation studies in a variety of ways: designing, collecting information, interpreting results, and preparing to use the results in improving local special education programs. (See page 46.)

c. As part of its technical assistance in local special education program evaluation, the Department of Education held or sponsored 20 workshops for 267 local staff. The workshops were conducted in cooperation with the eight Evaluation Improvement Program Regional Centers. (See page 41, Table VI-2, and Appendix B.)

d. All 97 LPAs were preparing to conduct their own evaluation studies during 1981-82. (See Appendix F.)

7. Was Evaluation Used to Improve Special Education Programs?

a. Statewide trends were noted in program operations related to California's goal of full educational opportunity for each child who needs special educational services. Positive trends suggested that no major changes in emphasis were needed in areas such as due process protections and development of individualized education programs. (See pages 21 and 47.) Continuing needs, such as technical assistance in local program evaluation, led to a statewide technical assistance effort. (See page 37.) Unsatisfactory trends, such as continued perception of paperwork burdens, led to proposals for changes in local forms and for publicity on the local and state uses of teacher-provided information. (See pages 10 and 46.)

b. Special education LPAs made local decisions on staff allocation, emphases for staff development, transportation services, paperwork reduction, compliance actions, and program location, based in part on the information gained in local evaluation studies. Program changes over a period of years were examined by several LPAs. (See page 46.)

c. At the school level, the evaluation studies offered opportunities for school site and itinerant staff, along with parents, students, and community advisory committees, to ask program questions and to use their own answers to improve programs. Examples are improvements in communicating about students at the critical points of changes between elementary and secondary high school sites. (See page 47.)

d. In preparing for full implementation of Master Plan services throughout California during 1981-82, the Department and the 97 LPAs worked together to design 145 local evaluation studies and a comprehensive statewide evaluation plan. (See pages 41 and 48 and Appendix F.)

INTRODUCTION TO THE 1980-81 EVALUATION REPORT ON THE CALIFORNIA MASTER PLAN FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION

The purpose of this seventh annual report is to describe the evaluation efforts, the evaluation results, and the use of evaluation in improving special education programs under the California Master Plan for Special Education. The report contains findings on the availability of special education services to students, services according to individual education programs, least restrictive environment, student performance, and attitudes toward special education services; and describes the actions taken by the Department and by local staff to evaluate special education programs and to use evaluation in improving local programs. Fiscal information is contained in a separate volume.

Legislative Authorization for the Department's Report

This report is authorized under Education Code Section 56602, which calls for the Superintendent of Public Instruction to submit annually--to the State Board of Education, the Legislature, and the Governor--an annual evaluation report of special education programs conducted under the California Master Plan for Special Education. (See Appendix C for the wording of the Education Code provisions.)

Pursuant to Education Code Section 56607, the Department has contracted with SRI International (SRI) to conduct an independent evaluation of Master Plan programs through January 1982. The contractor is responsible for preparing reports emphasizing the summative outcome aspects of special education programs.

Special Education Programs Under the California Master Plan

The California Master Plan for Special Education is a comprehensive approach to provide special education services in the more than a thousand school districts and offices of county superintendents of schools throughout the state. These services are designed to provide appropriate educational opportunities for all individuals with exceptional needs. Continual local evaluation is required to ensure the highest quality educational offerings.

Traditionally, special education programs were authorized on a categorical basis related to a specific handicapping condition. As parents of children with various specific handicaps voiced their needs over a period of more than 100 years, new programs were added until 28 different categorical programs were funded. Although this approach provided necessary services to many handicapped individuals, many other children with exceptional needs were either not receiving services or were receiving limited services often inappropriate to their educational needs. There was little or no systematic evaluation of local programs and no statewide evaluation.

The development of the California Master Plan for Special Education began in 1970 with extensive studies and reviews of existing special education services and included a series of statewide public input seminars.

This information provided a basis for the development of a plan for special education developed by the Department of Education and the Advisory Commission on Special Education, which the State Board of Education formally adopted as the California Master Plan for Special Education in January 1974. The California Master Plan preceded and is consistent with Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, which requires states to provide an appropriate publicly supported education to handicapped children.

The major features of the California Master Plan and its authorizing legislation include the following:

I. Special education local plan areas (LPAs)

- District and county boards of education, with advice from a community committee, choose the form of organization best suited to their local situations and the needs of their handicapped children. An LPA may be composed of a single large school district, two or more districts, or two or more school districts and an office of a county superintendent of schools. Whatever the pattern of organization, the LPA must be large enough to provide the full range of services required by individuals with exceptional needs. This combination of resources allows for the provision of services that a single small or medium-sized school district or office of a county superintendent of schools might not be able to provide.

- A local plan is developed by each applicant LPA for the geographical area served by the local educational agency or agencies participating in the LPA. The local plan is commented on by the community advisory committee and approved by the local school board or boards before being submitted to the Department and to the State Board of Education. The local plan tailors the requirements of the Master Plan to the needs of the children and the local area. Each local plan must include an indication of how the applicant will (1) provide for the seeking out of all local individuals with exceptional needs; (2) make services available to meet the needs of all individuals identified as having exceptional needs; (3) provide for parental involvement and procedural safeguards; (4) use available resources at the local level to meet the needs of individuals with exceptional needs; (5) conduct staff development activities for regular and special education staff; and (6) manage local programs.

- When the applicant's local plan is accepted by the State Department of Education and approved by the State Board of Education, the geographic area covered by the plan is then known as a special education local plan area (LPA).

- Each special education LPA develops an annual local evaluation plan tailored to its local needs which will also meet state and federal requirements. The plan is reviewed and approved by the Department of Education.

- Each LPA has a community advisory committee. Parents comprise the majority of the committee. Among other tasks, the committee advises the LPA in the development and review of programs under the local comprehensive plan, assists in parent education, and encourages public involvement in the plan.

- In implementing its local plan, each LPA uses the services of program specialists. Among the responsibilities assigned to persons in this staff position in the Master Plan are ensuring adequate curricular resources to all staff members who work with special class students and assessing the effectiveness of special education programs.

- In evaluating the special education programs, each LPA designs and conducts at least one special evaluation study each year to answer local evaluation questions and improve its own programs.

2. Instruction and educational services

- Special education means instruction and educational services specially designed to meet the unique needs of individuals with exceptional needs and provided at no cost to the parent or child. Such instruction and services may include (but are not necessarily limited to) classroom instruction, language and speech instruction, psychological services, educationally related therapies, special physical education and vocational education programs, parent education, health nursing services, and school social work.

- Each LPA's local plan includes four instructional components:

  (1) special classes and centers; (2) the resource specialist program; (3) designated instruction and services; and (4) nonpublic school services.

- Special classes and centers are designed for children with moderate or severe handicaps who are able to spend little or no time in regular classrooms.

- Through the resource specialist program, instructional planning, special instruction, tutorial assistance, and other services are provided to individuals with exceptional needs in regular classrooms or special programs or both. Assistance to teachers in regular classrooms may also be provided.

- Designated instruction and services are specific and are not normally provided in regular and special class programs or in resource specialist programs. One example is speech and language therapy for children who have difficulties in talking. Another example is orientation and mobility training for children who cannot see well enough to get around by themselves.

- Nonpublic school services are offered to individuals with exceptional needs when the staff and the parent determine that services appropriate to the needs of the individual child are not available in the public school.

- State residential school services are also available to meet highly specialized educational needs of individual students.

3. Provision of services

- Special education services are offered in the regular class or in a special education setting, in cooperation with the student's parents, and according to each student's individually determined need as reflected in an individualized education program (IEP).

- The processes of identification, assessment, and instructional planning for individuals with exceptional needs are conducted by individualized education program planning teams (IEP teams) in each LPA. An IEP team reviews all referrals within a particular school and makes recommendations regarding such referrals in accordance with state and federal laws and regulations. Specialized educational assessment personnel review referrals for in-depth studies of individual students; the referrals come from IEP teams, from parents, and from other sources. On request, specialized assessment personnel conduct assessments of students and make recommendations to an IEP team, as appropriate. An IEP team is responsible for reviewing each student's progress at least annually and for revising the IEP. Parents are encouraged to participate in each step.

- A written individualized education program (IEP) is developed for each special education student. An IEP describes the student's need, the type and amount of special education services to help the student, the objectives the student is to achieve, participation in regular programs, and methods of assessing progress.

- The intent of helpful attention to the needs of each child is carried out by supplying information to parents, by conducting careful assessments, and by making individual decisions for each child.

4. Individuals with exceptional needs

Individuals with exceptional needs are those students whose educational needs cannot be met within the regular classroom, even with modification of the regular program; and who have been determined by both parents and professionals to require the additional benefit of special education because of demonstrated physical, intellectual, or serious emotional handicap or as a result of a specified behavior, learning, or language disorder.

5. State financial assistance

State financial assistance to special education programs has changed several times under the Master Plan authorizing legislation, first under Assembly Bill 4040, then under Assembly Bill 1250, and later under Senate Bill 1870. The proportion of the state funding was increased, provisions were made for future annual inflation adjustment, and in SB 1870, the fiscal model was changed.

6. Comprehensive program evaluation

Evaluation responsibilities are placed on the Department and on LPAs. The intent of local evaluation is to improve local programs. The intent of state evaluation is to provide information for refining programs and for judging the merits of statewide programs, while simultaneously providing technical assistance to LPAs, coordinating the design of local and statewide evaluations, minimizing duplication of effort, reducing the paperwork burden on local schools, and preparing statewide evaluation plans and reports.

Impact of Previous Years' Evaluation Reports

In previous reports the Department noted several topics of statewide concern. The actions taken in 1980-81 by the Department and the special education local plan areas (LPAs) to address those concerns are summarized as follows:

The Needs of Regular Classroom Teachers

The emphasis in staff development shifted from general awareness of handicapped students and the law to knowledge and skills for teaching individual handicapped students. The Department conducted a statewide study of staff development, and found a great need for coordinating existing resources and for conducting follow-up assistance in schools and classrooms. Local studies showed both areas of accomplishment and continuing concerns, particularly at the high school level.

Paperwork Burdens

The Department continued to emphasize local evaluation studies and to minimize statewide Department evaluation studies. The Department used existing information whenever possible, rather than collecting additional data. The authors of a study of local paperwork found that about one-third of the burden was due to local requirements over and beyond state (and federal) requirements, and recommended that LPAs examine and streamline their paperwork. However, changes in state and federal data collection and reporting requirements continued to cause difficulties for local agencies and led to some local overcollection of data.

Measurement of Student Progress

Special education LPAs continued to review each child's progress at least annually. An increased number of local evaluation studies were conducted on the performance of groups of students. While in general the progress of individual students was satisfactory to parents, the progress of groups of students, particularly at the high school level, remained a concern.

Regionalization

The number of special education local plan areas (LPAs) increased from 21 to 42 in 1980-81. All districts and offices of county superintendents of schools in California were scheduled to be in 97 operational LPAs during 1981-82 and were intensively working for a smooth start. Governance and fiscal issues continued as concerns.

Needs of Special Education Students in Secondary Schools

Several LPAs emphasized secondary students and staff in their local evaluation studies, and made program changes as a result, such as increasing the communication between elementary, junior high, and senior high schools. Concerns remained for increasing the availability of vocational and career preparation opportunities and for focusing on high school graduation requirements.

Lack of Clear Eligibility Criteria

In accordance with an interagency agreement, the State Department of Education assisted the California Youth Authority in developing eligibility criteria for learning handicapped programs and for identifying students with severe emotional disturbances. Recent legislation (Senate Bill 769, Chapter 1094, Statutes of 1981) requires the adoption of regulations governing eligibility for special education in special education local plan areas. This legislation requires that the State Board of Education consider any eligibility options which may be indicated by SRI International in its independent evaluation of the Master Plan.

Statewide Need for Local Program Evaluation Capability

Eighteen of the 21 established special education LPAs conducted their own evaluation studies to answer their own local questions, according to their own local evaluation plans. In preparation for statewide implementation of the California Master Plan for Special Education in 97 LPAs during 1981-82, the Department conducted a statewide series of workshops on local special education evaluation, in cooperation with the eight Evaluation Improvement Program Regional Centers. A total of 145 local evaluation studies were planned by the 97 LPAs for 1981-82, with continuing technical assistance and coordination provided by the Department. (See Appendix F for the list of local evaluation study topics.)

Department of Education Evaluation Plan for 1980-81

The Department's plan for 1980-81 was a cooperative effort with the special education local plan areas. One purpose of the Department's evaluation effort was to prepare for statewide implementation of the California Master Plan for Special Education in 1981-82. The second purpose was to

provide the Legislature, the State Board of Education, the Governor, and state and local educational program administrators with the information needed to refine and improve policies, regulations, guidelines, and procedures on a continuing basis.

The Department's program evaluation plan emphasized the use of evaluation to improve local programs, was built on the results of previous evaluations, and was aimed at preventing duplication of efforts and minimizing data collection and reporting burdens at the school and district levels. In designing their local evaluation studies, local planning areas were encouraged to use existing information, such as student and program records, and to select samples of parents, teachers, and students, instead of conducting additional large-scale data collection activities.

The plan was designed to use the results of evaluation studies conducted by the established special education LPAs on topics of statewide interest: services according to individualized education programs, placement in least restrictive environment, student performance, and attitude toward special education services. The results of studies from eighteen LPAs were analyzed and interpreted for this report. Although limited in their generalizability, these findings are interesting as possible indicators of statewide trends, particularly over a two- or three-year period; to demonstrate local uses of local evaluation; and to provide ideas for future courses of action. (See Appendix A for a list of the LPAs whose evaluation studies were received in time to be analyzed for this report and Appendix D for the methods used by the LPAs in 1980-81.)

In preparing this evaluation report, the Department used a number of existing information sources and points of view. Information sources included child counts and evaluation studies from the LPAs; descriptions of special evaluation studies conducted by the Department; descriptions of technical assistance in local program evaluation provided by the Department; and previous Department evaluation reports. The information sources were analyzed, interpreted, and summarized for this report.

Seven major evaluation questions were the primary focus of the Department's evaluation efforts during 1980-81. Each question is discussed in a separate chapter in the report:

I. What was the availability of special education services to students under the California Master Plan for Special Education?

II. Did students receive special education services according to their individualized education programs?

III. Were handicapped students taught in their least restrictive environment?

IV. Did students change as a result of receiving special education services?

V. Were the attitudes of parents, students, and school staff favorable toward the special education services provided?

VI. Were special education local plan areas assisted in preparing to evaluate their own special education programs?

VII. Was evaluation used to improve special education programs?

CHAPTER I-- WHAT WAS THE AVAILABILITY OF SPECIAL EDUCATION SERVICES TO STUDENTS UNDER THE CALIFORNIA MASTER PLAN FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION?

The Department's first evaluation question for 1980-81 was, "What was the availability of special education services to students under the California Master Plan for Special Education?"

- o A total of 210,805 students were receiving special education services in 42 special education local plan areas (LPAs) on December 1, 1980, the annual counting day.
- o The 42 special education LPAs included more than half of the school districts and offices of county superintendent of schools offices in California.

Chapter I contains background information on the implementation of the Master Plan and a report on the progress that was made in 1980-81 toward the goal of providing full educational opportunity.

Implementation of the Master Plan

As shown in Chart I-1, the implementation of the California Master Plan for Special Education began in 1975-76, with six first-year implementer special education local plan areas (LPAs).

CHART I-1

Annual Progress of Implementation of the California Master Plan for Special Education, 1975-76 to 1981-82

Year	Number and status of Special Education Local Plan Areas (SELPAs)		
	First-year implementers	Established SELPAs	Total
1975-76	6	--	6
1976-77	4	6	10
1977-78	--	10	10
1978-79	7	10	17
1979-80	4	17	21
1980-81	21	21	42
1981-82 (projected)	42	55	97 (statewide)

Pursuant to Senate Bill 1870, Chapter 797, Statutes of 1980, Master Plan services are scheduled to be available statewide by the end of the 1981-82 schol year to children in all California school districts.

The original legislation (Assembly Bill 4040, Chapter 1532, Statutes of 1974) allowed only a few special education LPAs to enter the Master Plan in the first year, 1975-76. Several school districts, counties, or combinations of these submitted local plans; i.e., applications. Of these volunteers six were selected by the State Department of Education and approved by the State Board of Education to pilot the concepts contained in the Master Plan beginning in 1975-76. This selection was based on such criteria as size and scope of the programs proposed in the local plan; compliance with legal requirements; state distribution factors (e.g., north, south, central; urban, rural; minority populations represented; and so on); and availability of funds. During 1975-76 additional plans were submitted to the State Department of Education for possible selection in 1976-77. Four plans were selected through the use of the criteria previously listed. In 1978-79 an additional seven areas were added through the same competitive planning and application process.

According to AB 1250, Chapter 1247, Statutes of 1977, which authorized a phased statewide implementation, in 1978-79 the State Board of Education adopted a phase-in plan identifying the specific LPAs to enter the Master Plan beginning in 1979-80, 1980-81, and 1981-82. This movement from a competitive planning process allowed local schools to set a date for implementation of quality programs under the Master Plan and to spend less time on submitting and resubmitting competitive local plans for state approval. During 1979-80, more than 100,000 children were served by 17 established and four first-year implementer LPAs.

Progress Toward the Goal of Full Educational Opportunity in 1980-81

During 1980-81 more than 200,000 children were receiving special education services in 21 established and 21 first-year implementer special education LPAs under the California Master Plan for Special Education. Together, the 42 LPAs included more than one-half of the one thousand plus school districts and offices of county superintendents of schools in California. Geographical areas were changed in three established LPAs. In two of these LPAs, the configuration of constituent districts was changed. In the third LPA, the entire large metropolitan district came under the Master Plan according to its phase-in plan. In the remaining areas of the state, 55 "planning" LPAs scheduled for establishment in 1981-82 were serving approximately 150,000 children as they prepared to offer Master Plan services and to evaluate their special education programs.

Student enrollment. On December 1, 1980, the annual "counting day," the 42 LPAs reported serving a total of 210,805 students in special education programs, as compared to 102,275 reported by 21 LPAs on December 1, 1979. As shown in Table I-1, more than two-thirds of the students were enrolled in regular classes and received designated instruction and services (35.1 percent) or resource specialist program services (34.5 percent). About one-fourth of the students were enrolled in special day classes (28.9 percent). A small number of students were enrolled in nonpublic schools (1.4 percent).

TABLE I-1

Students Served in Four Special Education Programs
on December 1, 1980, in 42 Special Education Local Plan Areas

Special education program and instructional setting	Students served	
	Total	Percent
Designated instruction and services and regular class	74,078	35.1
Resource specialist program and regular class	72,790	34.5
Special class or center	61,002	28.9
Nonpublic schooling under Master Plan	2,935	1.4
Total on December 1, 1980	210,805	

Source: "Special Education Pupil Count and Staff Data, December 1, 1980." Sacramento: California State Department of Education, Office of Special Education, 1981.

Ethnicity. On December 1, 1980, the 42 LPAs reported serving students in six ethnic groups, as shown in Table I-2. Proportional to the ethnic distribution of the kindergarten through twelfth grade (K-12) enrollment in these 42 LPAs, more white and black students were receiving special education services than was true for any of the other ethnic groups. Table I-2 also shows the ethnic distribution of K-12 enrollment in the 42 LPAs and in all California public schools.

Movement of students among instructional settings. Over a one-year period, the 18 established LPAs whose geographical boundaries remained the same reported that a total of 14,328 (17 percent) students moved out of special education programs to regular classes; 22,624 (28 percent) students moved from one special education program to another. Table I-3 displays the information from a one-year follow up of 82,189 students who were receiving special education services on December 1, 1979. For example, 27,860 students were enrolled in regular classes and were receiving designated instruction and services (DIS). Where were the students one year later? Seven thousand, seven hundred and eleven (27.7 percent) had moved to regular classes without special education services. Fourteen thousand, two hundred and sixty-eight (51.2 percent) remained in the same placement: enrolled in a regular class and receiving DIS. One thousand, six hundred twenty-two (5.8 percent) had moved to regular classes and were receiving resource specialist program services. One thousand, sixty-three (3.8 percent) had moved to a special class or center.

TABLE I-2

Student Ethnicity in 42 Special Education Local Plan Areas, by Enrollment in Special Education Programs and in Kindergarten and Grades One through Twelve

Ethnicity	Student enrollment in special education programs*		Percent of total K-12 student enrollment**	
	Number	Percent	42 LPAs	State-wide
American Indian/ Alaskan native	1,492	0.71	0.91	0.91
Black, not of Hispanic origin	23,889	11.33	9.42	10.41
Asian	4,626	2.19	3.92	4.31
Filipino	1,421	0.67	1.30	1.44
Hispanic	49,577	23.52	26.31	23.39
White, not of Hispanic origin	129,800	61.57	58.15	59.94
Total	210,805	--	--	

Sources: *"Special Education Pupil Count and Staff Data, December 1, 1980." Sacramento: California State Department of Education, Office of Special Education, 1981.

**Racial and Ethnic Distribution of Students and Staff in California Public Schools, Fall, 1979. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, Office of Intergroup Relations, 1980.

Progress Expected in 1981-82

During 1981-82, Master Plan services will be available to all children throughout California, as all school districts and offices of county superintendents of schools will be included in special education local plan areas. It is anticipated that approximately 375,000 students will be receiving special education services in 97 special education local plan areas on December 1, 1981, the annual counting day.

TABLE I-3

Movement of Special Education Students from Four Instructional Settings
Over a One-Year Period in 18 Special Education Local Plan Areas

Number of students in four instructional settings and special education programs as of December 1, 1979	Student Placement as of December 1, 1980					
	Moved to regular class without special education programs	Moved to special education settings				
		Designated instruction and services	Resource specialist program	Special class or center	Nonpublic schooling	Other*
Regular class and designated instruction and services 27,860 students	7,711 27.7%	** (14,268) (51.2%)	1,622 5.8%	1,063 3.8%	15 0.05%	3,181 11.4%
Regular class and resource specialist program 32,334 students	5,055 15.6%	1,223 3.8%	** (19,111) (59.1%)	2,017 6.24%	6 0.02%	4,922 15.2%
Special class or center 21,580 students	1,546 7.2%	577 2.7%	1,672 7.7%	** (14,615) (67.7%)	27 0.13%	3,143 14.6%
Nonpublic schooling 415 students	16 3.9%	14 3.4%	13 3.1%	47 11.3%	** (265) (63.9%)	60 14.5%
Total 82,189 students percent of total	14,328 17.4%	16,082 19.6%	22,418 27.3%	17,742 21.6%	313 0.38%	11,306 13.8%

Source: "Special Education Pupil Count and Staff Data," December 1, 1980. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, Office of Special Education, 1981.

*"Other" was defined as "Graduation, dropout, death, transfer out of LPA, and incomplete information."
**The information in these four boxes indicates the number and percentage of students who remained in the same instructional setting one year later.

CHAPTER II--DID STUDENTS RECEIVE SPECIAL EDUCATION SERVICES ACCORDING TO INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAMS?

One of the Department's major evaluation questions for 1980-81 was, "Did students receive special education services according to individualized education programs (IEPs)?"

- Through the process of assessment and development of IEPs, care was taken to determine each child's need for special education services. An IEP was designed by an IEP team for each child before special education services were provided. The rights of parents and children were protected.

- Both special and regular teachers were teaching according to their students' individualized education programs (IEPs).

- Student progress was carefully noted and discussed. Students' IEPs were revised to reflect changes in needs.

Chapter II contains background information on the evaluation of IEPs, the results of the Department's analysis and interpretation of local evaluation studies conducted by 17 of the established special education local plan areas (LPAs) in 1980-81, and statewide conclusions and trends over the period 1976-77 through 1980-81.

Evaluation of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs)

One of the major features of the California Master Plan for Special Education is the emphasis on the needs and abilities of each student and the provision of special education services on the basis of need, not handicapping condition, as stated in each student's IEP. Special education services include classroom instruction, language and speech instruction, psychological services, educationally related therapies and recreation services, special physical education, and vocational education programs.

The individualized education program (IEP) is a document developed by an IEP team composed of school staff and the parents of the student, and when appropriate, the student himself or herself. The IEP describes the student's need, the type and amount of special education services to help the student, the extent of participation in regular education programs, the objectives the student is expected to achieve, and methods of assessing progress. During the one-year period from December 1, 1979, to December 1, 1980, IEPs were developed for over 59,000 students newly served in special education programs in the 21 established special education LPAs.

From the beginning of the California Master Plan for Special Education, the Department has worked cooperatively with the established LPAs to examine the concept of IEPs in practice. As more LPAs began to design and conduct their own evaluation studies, the Department shifted its emphasis from conducting statewide studies to assisting LPAs in designing their own

studies and to analyzing the results of those studies for incorporation in the Department's annual evaluation report.

Findings on Services According to IEPs in 1980-81

The local evaluation studies from the LPAs provided information about the three phases of service: (1) before placement in special education programs, or identification, assessment, and instructional planning; (2) providing instructional services--teaching; and (3) review of student progress after receiving instruction--again, identification, assessment, and instructional planning.

The LPAs gathered this information by reviewing student records, including IEPs; analyzing program records, such as the number of referrals; surveying and interviewing school staff, parents, and students; visiting school sites; observing classrooms and IEP team meetings; and making comparisons with other studies. (See Appendix D for a discussion of the methods used by LPAs in 1980-81.) Findings for each phase of service will be summarized separately. Findings are from individual LPAs, unless otherwise stated.

Phase 1. Before Placement in Special Education Programs. Studies from 17 LPAs contained information about identification, assessment and instructional planning:

-- Fewer students were referred in 1980-81 than in the previous year, but a higher percentage was declared eligible--2,030 new students enrolled.

-- Some of the regular teachers were confused about the referral process, but, on the whole, the process was working.

-- Students in two LPAs were referred for possible study by their parents or guardians, staff in the public schools, and public and private agencies. Referrals were also made by the schools to other community agencies.

-- Both LPA and outside assessment personnel used standardized tests in the areas of reading, arithmetic, and language. Most frequently used were the Wide Range Achievement Test, the Peabody Individual Achievement Test, the Keymath Arithmetic Test, and the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test.

-- In 16 of the 31 schools visited by an LPA team, the students had objectives to be carried out at home.

-- Parents, resource specialists, and principals in two LPAs agreed that the IEP development process worked well and on-time for initial child study, assessment, and IEP team meetings; and while the key person was the resource specialist, parents contributed much helpful information.

-- Students' IEPs were, on the whole, well done in two LPAs.

-- Enrollment of students in special education programs as a percentage of total district enrollment has stabilized over the past two years.

-- IEPs were documented and being carried out, according to team visits to 120 schools in five LPAs.

-- Although there were some sites at which files were poorly organized and some information was missing or omitted, another LPA's review of findings over three years showed much progress, with student records nearly universally in compliance.

-- Due process procedures were documented according to student record reviews in six LPAs.

-- Students took part in about one-fifth of the IEP team meetings.

Phase 2. Providing Instructional Services--Teaching. Studies from 12 LPAs provided information about teaching handicapped students:

-- Teachers were individualizing students' work and assignments and had the appropriate supplies and equipment.

-- All the services indicated on a student's IEP were being provided for nearly all students in resource specialist programs or special classes in five LPAs.

-- Teachers of hearing impaired students reviewed their own progress in implementing the instructional objectives in their students' IEPs, and they reported that the implementation ranged from 40 percent to 95 percent.

-- Resource specialists were teaching their handicapped students up to six hours a week in regular classrooms.

-- Instructional aides in resource specialist programs and special day classes worked with handicapped students in regular classrooms.

-- During one month alone in one large urban district LPA, 25,508 handicapped students were being taught by 1,876 special class teachers and resource specialist program teachers, while another 191 handicapped students were enrolled in teleclasses (telephone/television) taught by ten teachers.

-- In three LPAs, about one-third of the handicapped students in resource specialist programs and over one-half of those students in special classes were also receiving services from the designated instruction and services staff.

-- Career or vocational education were mentioned in about one-half of the high school students' IEPs.

-- The teacher-to-student ratios in resource specialist programs ranged from 1:15 to 1:26.

-- A locally-trained team judged the special education programs at 17 schools to be overall of high quality and found only seven instances in which corrective actions for compliance were called for. The actions were taken by appropriate site or LPA staff.

Phase 3. Review of Student Progress After Receiving Instruction. Studies from six LPAs contained information about the reviews of student progress:

-- Annual reviews of the progress of all students were conducted in two LPAs.

-- Annual reviews were scheduled on the basis of birthdates rather than end-of-year for many students.

-- Weekly progress of students was charted in resource specialist programs and special classes more than in designated instruction and services.

-- The IEP team process worked well and on time for annual reviews.

-- Resource specialists of one large LPA reported that about 40 percent of their students remained in the program for more than one year and would, therefore, require health and psychological screening. In their opinion, the existing frequent contact with school psychologists and nurse would facilitate the needed in-depth assessment.

-- Updates of IEPs were made by revising objectives, developing new objectives, changing the time line for accomplishment, changing the students' placement, or using the results of a reassessment of the student's needs and abilities.

Statewide Conclusions and/or Trends Over the Period 1976-77 through 1980-81

- School staff and parents are using the individualized education program process to communicate and plan together for the benefit of the student as well as to carry out the due process protections.

- Examining compliance with legal requirements is a responsibility placed on the chief administrator in multiple-district special education LPAs.

- Community advisory committees play a vital role in developing and carrying out evaluation studies which involve parents.

- LPAs are able to keep track of their handicapped students and use their own existing program information.

CHAPTER III--WERE HANDICAPPED STUDENTS TAUGHT IN THEIR LEAST RESTRICTIVE ENVIRONMENT?

The Department's third evaluation question for 1980-81 was, "Were handicapped students taught in their least restrictive environment?"

- Individual decisions were made by parents and school staff about the special and regular instructional settings for each student.
- Both handicapped and nonhandicapped students benefited from their interaction in regular program activities.
- Opportunities in regular school programs were available for, and used by, handicapped students enrolled in special day classes and in special centers.
- The in-service training needs of regular classroom teachers for teaching their handicapped students were addressed, and the needs of special education staff were also addressed.

Chapter III contains background information on the evaluation of least restrictive environment; the results of the Department's analysis and interpretation of local evaluation studies conducted in 1980-81 by 12 established special education LPAs; and statewide conclusions and trends from 1976-77 through 1980-81.

Evaluation of Least Restrictive Environment

Two of the major features of the California Master Plan for Special Education are the emphasis on the needs and abilities of each individual student and the provision of special education services on the basis of the most appropriate instructional setting or settings, as stated in each student's IEP, not on handicapping condition. The instructional settings available include the regular classroom, the resource specialist program, special class, special center, the student's home or hospital, nonpublic school, and the six state special residential schools operated by the Department. It should be noted that a given student may participate in one or more setting during the same school day and that most students participate in regular class for at least part of their school day.

The least restrictive environment (LRE) is a concept which is kept in mind by the child's parents and school staff as an IEP is developed, and as the results of the child's participation in particular instructional settings are noticed. The decision about the extent of participation in regular class is made individually for each student and is documented in each student's IEP.

At the annual review of student progress, the appropriateness of the various instructional settings is again discussed. Whenever a student is changing schools, particularly in going from an elementary school to a

junior high or from junior high to senior high, the decision on regular class participation also includes the selection of appropriate regular class subjects and the selection of appropriate regular class teachers.

From the beginning of the implementation of the California Master Plan for Special Education, the Department has worked cooperatively with the established special education LPAs to examine the concept of least restrictive environment in practice.

Findings on Least Restrictive Environment in 1980-81

The LPAs' local evaluation studies provided information about individual decisions, the benefits to handicapped and nonhandicapped students, opportunities for handicapped students in special classes and special centers, and the needs of regular and special education staff. The LPAs gathered this information by reviewing student records; surveying and interviewing school staff, parents, and students; visiting school sites; observing classrooms and IEP meetings; and reviewing studies done in previous years. (See Appendix D for a discussion of the methods used by the LPAs in 1980-81). Findings for each aspect of least restrictive environment will be summarized separately. Findings are for individual LPAs, unless otherwise stated.

Individual decisions. Studies from three LPAs contained information on the decisions on the most appropriate instructional setting:

-- Parents actively participated in most of the IEP team meetings.

-- Interpreters were available in two LPAs for non-English-speaking parents.

-- In the child study and IEP development process, the resource specialists in two LPAs were the key personnel.

Benefits to handicapped and nonhandicapped students. Studies from three LPAs contained information on the benefits of participation in particular settings:

-- Although nearly all handicapped students in three LPAs made social progress in their regular classes, some students experienced difficulties in keeping up with the work load.

-- Handicapped students in three LPAs were more confident, had more friends than in the past, brought assignments home, and looked for jobs for the first time.

-- Regular students in two LPAs indicated knowledge of the purpose of special education programs.

-- Regular education students in the seventh grade participated in awareness assemblies on "Being Handicapped," presented by LPA program specialists.

-- (Note also the findings in Chapter IV, changes in student performance, and in Chapter V, attitudes toward special education services.)

Opportunities in regular school programs for handicapped students enrolled in special day classes and special centers. Studies from nine LPAs contained information about regular program participation:

-- Special day class students in six LPAs participated in regular classes, as had been specified in their IEPs.

-- Special center students (severely emotionally disturbed) attended regular or continuation high schools as they made progress.

-- Almost half of the high school students in special day classes were enrolled in regular vocational education programs and classes on and off their high school campuses.

-- Integration was seen as the special education teacher's responsibility at the elementary school level.

-- Recognizing the need for expanded career and vocational education opportunities for seventh and eighth grade handicapped students, one LPA formed a six-person task force, including a parent representative, to recommend specific actions to be taken for the 1981-82 school year.

Needs of regular teachers and special education staff. Studies from eight LPAs contained information about staff efforts and resources needed to teach handicapped students in their own classrooms:

-- Regular classroom teachers varied in their knowledge of special education programs and procedures in one LPA and in their active participation in discussions at IEP team meetings in two other LPAs.

-- High school vocational education teachers in two LPAs were accepting special education students.

-- Special education teachers in two LPAs provided informal staff development at their own schools.

-- There was some confusion about the roles of regular education and special education administrators on regular school campuses.

-- Regular education teacher participation in IEP development and IEP team meetings had increased over the past three years.

-- Regular teachers in one LPA had the materials they needed to carry out their part of students' IEPs, but they needed help in handling students with behavior problems in another LPA.

-- In-service workshops were conducted by five LPAs for regular and special teachers on topics determined by the results of surveys

conducted during the last months of the previous school year. For example, in one large LPA alone, over 400 regular teachers participated in workshops on topics such as overview of special education legislation, parent and child rights, instructing handicapped students in regular classrooms, enhancing positive attitudes toward handicapped children and adults, and improving their own speaking and listening skills in Spanish.

-- Teachers, principals, and parents rated the workshops they attended as exceptionally good, in both content and materials, and they wanted more time in such workshops, which were attended by over 3,500 persons.

-- A Department-sponsored study found great efforts and great needs for staff development, particularly for coordinating existing resources and for follow-up in schools and classrooms.

Statewide Conclusions and/or Trends From 1967-77 Through 1980-81

- o School staff and parents are considering the needs of the child in determining the most appropriate instructional setting.
- o Regular teachers are seen as more accepting of special education students.
- o Staff development activities are aimed at the everyday use of information and skills on the job with special and regular education students.
- o Resource specialists and the school principal are the key persons at the school sites.

CHAPTER IV--DID STUDENTS CHANGE AS A RESULT OF RECEIVING SPECIAL EDUCATION SERVICES?

Chapter IV answers another perennial evaluation question, "Did students change as a result of receiving special education services?"

- Students made progress in seven aspects of growth and development: personal development, participation in regular class, school conduct and participation in school activities, peer group relations, study habits and skills, academic achievement, and work habits and skills.

- Student progress was measured by teacher judgments, weekly progress charting, analysis of class assignments, parent observations, students' self-reports, academic achievement test scores, and ratings of attainment of objectives in IEPs.

- Annual reviews of student progress indicated that the progress warranted consideration of a change in instructional placement, such as going from special class to the resource specialist program.

- Not all students accomplished all the objectives in their IEPs. For those students, the IEP was reexamined, along with possible reasons for the less-than-full attainment.

Chapter IV contains background information on the evaluation of student performance; the results of the Department's analysis and interpretation of local evaluation studies conducted in 1980-81 by ten established special education local plan areas (LPAs); and statewide conclusions and trends over the period 1976-77 through 1980-81.

Evaluation of Student Performance

Two of the major features of the California Master Plan for Special Education are the emphasis on the needs and abilities of each student and the attention given continually to the changes in various aspects of the student's growth and development. In developing the objectives of each student's first IEP, an IEP team must choose between over-expectation, with certain failure, and under-expectation, with trivial and meaningless success. In measuring the individual student's change--whether progress, status quo, or regression--the IEP team, particularly the teacher and parent, has the benefit of shared experiences and can strike a more appropriate balance between over-expectation and under-expectation. The absolute amount of progress or regression is not nearly so important as is the immediate intervention once an educationally important change in student performance is detected. In special education, daily observation by teachers and parents and frequent communication are the chief instruments for measuring and reporting change in an individual student. A student's IEP is much like a continuous miniature research project, with one person--the student--as the scope of the research. When it is appropriate, the student participates in the measurement and reporting.

From the beginning of the implementation of the California Master Plan for Special Education, the Department has worked with the special education LPAs to examine the concept and practice of measurement of the performance of groups of special education students.

Findings on Student Performance in 1980-81

The LPAs' local evaluation studies provided information about student performance in seven aspects of growth and development. The LPAs gathered this information by reviewing student records, including IEPs; surveying and interviewing parents, school staff, and students; analyzing scores on standardized tests and of ratings of attainment of objectives; examining studies of promotion to higher grade levels; and examining how students were meeting local graduation requirements. (See Appendix D for a discussion of the methods used by LPAs in 1980-81.) Findings for each aspect of student growth and development will be summarized separately. Findings are from individual LPA studies of student performance, unless otherwise stated. (See also Chapters III and V.)

Personal development

-- Self-concept and self-confidence improved.
-- Sense of responsibility and self-control improved.
-- Behavior improved.

Participation in regular class

-- Returning students could handle regular classroom demands.

-- Careful placement on regular campuses and in continuation schools promoted success.

School conduct and participation in school activities

-- School attendance improved for intermediate and high school students chiefly because of counseling through student-teacher contact.

Peer group relations

-- Regular and special students reported having friends in each others' classes.

-- Social skills improved in two LPAs.

-- Students talked about problems rather than hitting or throwing.

Study habits and skills

-- Resource specialist students learned best when they understood the assignment and could work a step at a time, alone or in small groups, and discuss the work.

-- Parents reported that their children improved their concentration and remembered things better than in the past.

Academic skills and achievement

-- Parents and school staff in two LPAs noticed improvement.

-- A variety of tests and measures of achievement were being used, along with weekly progress charting.

-- Most handicapped students passed the LPA's minimum competency test and graduated. Nearly all the students who failed to pass decided to stay in school another year to learn more and try again.

-- According to teacher judgment, hearing-impaired students were accomplishing an average of 72 percent of all the objectives in their IEPs, with a range of 50 percent to 99 percent.

-- Learning handicapped students in elementary schools scored higher on easier items, such as identifying alphabet letters, than on harder items, such as reading complete words and answering questions in a paragraph. Similar results were found in mathematics and written composition in a grade one criterion-referenced test taken by all students in the district.

-- Learning handicapped students scored lower in both reading and math after a summer vacation from school.

-- Learning handicapped students in special classes made about half as much gain on reading, spelling, and math tests as do typical regular students.

-- Communicatively handicapped and physically handicapped students, particularly in the primary grades, made more progress in reading, writing, and math than other handicapped students, according to ratings of attainment of their individual objectives by program specialists at the time of annual review of progress.

-- Over a period of three years in special education programs, more handicapped students were promoted from grade to grade in the elementary schools than in high schools.

Work habits and skills

-- The work-study coordinator was a key in successful student outside work experience.

Statewide Conclusions and/or Trends Over the Period 1976-77 through 1980-81

- The performance of groups of students is being studied more than in the past.
- The IEPs of individual students are being used as a source of program data as well as for recording the results of services to the individual student.
- Attention is being given to district graduation standards.
- The focus remains on the growth and development of the individual student.
- No single standardized measure of student performance fits all students at all ages. The most common measure continues to be daily observation by teachers and parents.

CHAPTER V--WERE THE ATTITUDES OF PARENTS, STUDENTS, AND SCHOOL STAFF FAVORABLE TOWARD THE SPECIAL EDUCATION SERVICES PROVIDED?

Chapter V answers one of the Department's major evaluation questions for 1980-81, "Were the attitudes of parents, students, and school staff favorable toward the special education services provided?"

- The overall level of satisfaction with special education programs and services remained high.
- Parents understood and appreciated the services their children were getting.
- Teachers were more accepting of handicapped students than they had been in the past and they wanted more information about how to teach them.

Chapter V contains background information on the evaluation of attitudes toward special education services; the results of the Department's analysis and interpretation of local evaluation studies conducted in 1980-81 by eleven special education local plan areas (LPAs); and statewide conclusions and trends over the period 1976-77 through 1980-81.

Evaluation of Attitudes Toward Special Education Services

One of the major features of the California Master Plan for Special Education is the emphasis on the needs and abilities of each individual student. Another feature is the participation of parents, students, school staff, and members of the community in planning and refining local special education programs to meet the needs of current and future students and to be as satisfying as possible to all concerned. The work on the California Master Plan for Special Education began in 1970, with a series of public meetings throughout the state in which the participants were asked to "tell us what you think things ought to be like."

This pattern of concern for community satisfaction has been shown throughout the implementation of the Master Plan. In any special education LPA, the local plan for providing special education services is developed and refined in cooperation with community leaders and agency staff. In addition, the plan must be acceptable to the local school board, or boards, in the case of multiple districts. A community advisory committee is designated to offer advice and be a channel for community suggestions and parent information.

Findings on Attitudes in 1980-81

The local evaluation studies provided information about attitudes expressed by six groups of persons: parents, regular and special teachers, program specialists, resource specialists, administrators, and students. The special education local plan areas (LPAs) gathered this information through interviewing individuals and groups and by distributing or mailing

surveys and questionnaires. (See Appendix D for a discussion of the methods used by the LPAs in 1980-81.) The findings for each of the six groups will be summarized separately.

An overview of the program aspects examined by the LPAs during 1980-81 is presented in Chart V-1. The numbers of LPAs studying the attitudes of the six groups toward each program area or service are identified in the chart. For example, four LPAs studied the attitudes of administrators toward "in-service training." It is important to note that each LPA designed its own evaluation study to answer its own local evaluation questions. The nature of the questions and the intended use of the results determined both the program aspects to be studied and the persons to be questioned.

Parents

-- Parents were satisfied with the IEP team process and time lines. (See the Introduction and Chapter II for discussions of the IEP, "individualized education program," developed for each student.)

- With special and regular education programs
- With special transportation services, by parents of handicapped students in special day classes
- With communications between school and home
- With vocational education programs, and wanted more
- With the progress their child was making
- With the early identification of their child's problem
- With the integration of their child in regular classes
- With facilities and equipment
- With the attention given to their rights and their children's rights
- With the assessment and study of their child
- With the carrying out of their child's IEP
- With the kinds of services provided
- With opportunities for parent participation and involvement

-- Urban parents were deeply interested in their children's education and wanted to participate actively. The main barriers were their work and the consequent difficulty of adjusting to school-time schedules. (The LPA's finding was confirmed by three comparable external studies)

CHART V-1

OVERVIEW OF PROGRAM ASPECTS EXAMINED IN LOCAL STUDIES OF ATTITUDES, 1980-81

Program area or service	Number of LPAs[1] examining attitudes toward each program aspect, by groups of persons questioned						
	Parents	Teachers		Resource specialists	Program specialists	Administrators	Students
		Reg.	Spec.				
Overall services	**	**	**	*		****	*
Early identification of children's problems	*						
Central location						*	
Transportation	*		*				
Cooperation of special education/ regular education	*	*	*				
Vocational education	**			*			
Integration	***	*	**	*	**		*
Facilities and equipment	*		*	*			*
Paperwork		*					
Student progress	****	*	**	*		**	
Parent knowledge	*						
Home/school communication	*****		**	*		*	*
Parent interest	*						
Parent and child rights--due process	******	*	*			*	
Opportunities for parent participation and involvement	**						
Parent education	*						
Referral		*					*
Development of IEP--team process	*******			*			
Assessment and child study	*			*		*	
Implementation of IEP	**		*				*
Kinds of services needed	**		*				*
Program specialist help			*				
In-service training	***	***	***	**	*	****	*
Consortium data system						*	
Community advisory committee						*	
Consortium governance						*	
Fiscal, capital outlay						*	
Areas to commend					**		
Labeling							*

[1] Each * represents one special education local planning area (LPA) examining the attitudes of one group of persons toward the program aspects listed in the left-hand column. Eleven LPAs conducted studies of attitudes during 1980-81.

-- Parents wanted more information and more services.

- Parent education workshops
- Community advisory committee
- Vocational education services

-- Parents were more knowledgeable about special education than in previous years.

Teachers, regular and special

-- Regular teachers disliked paperwork and meetings for developing IEPs but were pleased at the results.

-- Parents indicated that regular teachers were acceptive and supportive.

-- Special teachers were only mildly satisfied with the way referral procedures were working in some schools, but they were very pleased with the assistance given by their program specialists, particularly in chairing difficult IEP meetings.

-- Regular and special teachers appreciated each other's work, expressed general satisfaction with special education services, and were satisfied with the progress of their students and with due process procedures and in-service programs.

-- Special teachers were satisfied with transportation services for their students.

- With the acceptance of their students by regular teachers
- With the progress made by their students
- With communication with parents
- With due process procedures
- With the implementation of their students' IEPs
- With offerings of in-service training

Program specialists

-- In their classroom visits and school reviews, program specialists found many areas of program operation to commend.

Resource specialists

-- Resource specialists reported smooth operation of special education programs at many schools, but they believed improvements were needed for secondary students in career and vocational education programs.

- Were satisfied with special education services in general and with transportation, home-school communication, and integration in regular classrooms.

- Were satisfied with student progress and in-service training programs, with due process procedures and the development of IEPs, assessment, and child study.

- Expressed need for improved facilities.

Administrators

-- School principals expressed general satisfaction with special education programs and pointed out specific examples of good teaching and cooperation with parents.

-- A special center principal pointed out the strong points of a centralized location.

-- Special education administrators expressed general satisfaction with special education programs and student programs, with due process procedures, with parent-school communication, parent education, assessment and child study, in-service training programs, and the management system, with improvements needed in the management information system.

Students

-- Regular and special high school students appreciated special education programs and often referred themselves for help.

-- Student attitudes toward special education had continued to improve over the past three years. Labeling occurred less often, and the negative effects of labeling were seen as disappearing.

-- Special center high school students commented on their satisfaction at seeing their own improvement.

-- Hearing impaired students on a high school campus appreciated their special instruction and the opportunities for attending regular classes; wanted improved support services, such as interpreting, and a larger classroom; and wanted to stay at that campus.

-- Students attending in-service training programs rated them as effective.

-- Parents felt their children were satisfied with school "as a place to learn."

Statewide Conclusions and/or Trends Over the Period 1976-77 through 1980-81

o Special education services and processes are better understood than in the past and are working well.

- Regular education teachers are seen as accepting handicapped students.
- Program specialists are seen as excellent presenters of helpful special education information.
- There is widespread satisfaction with student progress.

CHAPTER VI- WERE SPECIAL EDUCATION LOCAL PLAN AREAS ASSISTED IN PREPARING TO EVALUATE THEIR OWN SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS?

Because 1980-81 was the final year of preparation for statewide implementation of Master Plan programs in 97 special education local plan areas, one of the Department's major evaluation questions was, "Were special education local plan areas (LPAs) assisted in preparing to evaluate their own special education programs?" There were four sub-questions regarding the capability of established, first-year implementers, and "planning" LPAs to conduct evaluation studies and to use this information to improve their own special education programs:

1. Did LPAs evaluate their special education programs? In 1980-81, 18 of the 21 established LPAs conducted one or more evaluation studies of their special education programs.

2. Did LPAs indicate a need for technical assistance to evaluate their special education programs? A statewide needs assessment conducted in the fall of 1980 indicated that 60 LPAs wanted assistance in planning, conducting, and using the evaluation results to improve their own special education programs.

3. Did the Department of Education provide the needed technical assistance? The Local Evaluation Assistance Unit of the Department's Office of Program Evaluation and Research (OPER), in conjunction with the eight Evaluation Improvement Program Regional Centers, provided technical assistance to 80 LPAs that were either conducting or planning to conduct an evaluation study of their special education programs.

4. Did LPAs use evaluation information to improve their programs? As described in Chapter VII, the 18 LPAs that conducted evaluation studies during the 1980-81 school year used their evaluation findings to improve and change their programs in aspects such as staff development, measurement of student performance, and parent participation.

Chapter VI contains background information on the Department's technical assistance in program evaluation for special education; activities in 1980-81; and activities planned for 1981-82.

The Department's Technical Assistance in Program Evaluation for Special Education

It is the intent of the California Master Plan for Special Education to provide special education services for all children identified by IEP teams as individuals with exceptional needs. It is further intended that these services address the educational needs of each student. Along with a phased statewide implementation of Master Plan services in special education local plan areas (LPAs) is a requirement for continual evaluation of the effectiveness of these special education programs by each LPA to ensure the highest quality educational offerings to the students served.

From the beginning of the implementation of the California Master Plan for Special Education, the Department's Office of Program Evaluation and Research (OPER) has worked with established, first-year implementers, and planning LPAs to develop local capability to evaluate special education programs. As the established LPAs began to plan and conduct their own evaluation studies, and the Master Plan was authorized statewide, OPER shifted its emphasis from working only with established LPAs to creating a statewide local evaluation capability. During 1979-80, the Local Evaluation Assistance Unit of OPER developed a three-year statewide plan to provide technical assistance to all LPAs. The intent of the plan was to ensure that each LPA would be able to conduct at least one evaluation study during 1981-82, the first year of statewide implementation of the Master Plan. In this effort, OPER has worked with the Department's Office of Special Education and the eight Evaluation Improvement Program Regional Centers. (See Appendix B for the list of centers.) The aim of the technical assistance was to have local evaluation studies whose results could be used locally to improve programs, to address current areas of concern, and to reflect the present status of special education programs at the state level.

Technical Assistance Activities in Evaluation for 1980-81

Six major activities were conducted by the Local Evaluation Assistance Unit during 1980-81:

1. A statewide needs assessment to determine the needs for technical assistance

2. Two-day workshops to upgrade evaluation skills and make LPAs aware of local evaluation requirements

3. One-day "hands-on" workshops to assist LPAs in the development of their evaluation plans for 1981-82

4. Preliminary review of local studies to ensure cost effectiveness and usability of the information derived from the studies

5. Final review of local plan and study designs (to be completed by the Local Evaluation Assistance Unit of OPER)

6. Ongoing assistance to established LPAs in conducting their 1980-81 studies

The activities were designed to focus on each LPA's program concerns or questions in relationship to the broad mandated statewide topics of statewide interest, as addressed in the Department's annual evaluation report. (See Appendix C.) The purpose of this effort was to assist each LPA to plan an evaluation study in one or more of these topics. The technical plan also addressed the unique demographic features and the specific technical assistance needs of each LPA in planning to conduct its first evaluation study.

In fall 1980, the Local Evaluation Assistance Unit, in conjunction with the eight Evaluation Improvement Program Regional Centers, conducted a statewide needs assessment to determine if LPAs needed technical assistance. This survey revealed several areas in which the 60 LPAs responding reported wanting some help. Chart VI-1, "Statewide Needs Assessment for Special Education Evaluation Technical Assistance," presents the answers to nine questions and a list of the specific types of assistance needed.

CHART VI-1

STATEWIDE NEEDS ASSESSMENT FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION EVALUATION TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Questions	Number of Special Education Local Plan Areas Responding-60	
	Yes	No
1. Is the director well acquainted with local, state and federal evaluation requirements (enumerative/special studies)?	35	25
2. Has the local agency assigned evaluation responsibilities for special education to any staff person?	31	29
3. Is the assigned person trained in program evaluation?	20	40
4. Does the assigned person understand the special education program and its evaluation requirements?	19	41
5. Is there support staff available to assist the evaluator?	30	30
6. Is there a budget to conduct evaluation activities?	5	55
7. If regional evaluation workshops and follow-up activities were offered, would you participate?	56	4
8. Are any special studies being conducted this year?	4	56
9. What specific assistance would you need to evaluate your programs?		

LIST (comments by local staff):

1. Awareness of guidelines

2. Selection of development of evaluation instruments

3. Utilization of data collected to apply to programs

4. Awareness of what is needed for evaluation

5. Knowledge of types of data to be collected

6. Program evaluation designs

7. Guidelines for conducting special studies

8. Workshops to develop test item alternatives

9. Evaluation of nonhomogenous classes

10. Evaluation of special education classes with multiple handicaps in special day classes

11. Evaluation of experimental classes resulting from waiver; i.e., permission to enroll students with different disabilities in one special day class.

12. Evaluation of mainstreaming effects

13. How to design and conduct a special study

14. Development of observation scales; i.e., criteria and procedures

15. Development of evaluation items in the cognitive area

16. Development of evaluation items in affective area

17. Validation of items to their specific domains

18. Breaking of major skill areas into more discrete or subskill areas and writing or selecting items to assess these skills

In cooperation with the Department's Office of Special Education, the Guide for Evaluating Special Education Programs was revised and used to assist LPAs in developing their own local evaluation capabilities. The contents of the guide and the accompanying materials were intended to:

1. Increase awareness of local, state and federal evaluation requirements.

2. Provide a process to begin to develop a local program evaluation plan for the purposes of improving local programs.

3. Utilize existing information for evaluation activities and avoid, whenever possible, additional data collection efforts.

4. Provide methods and procedures which could be used to develop and carry out a local evaluation plan. This included:

- Selection of instruments
- Methodology (designs, sampling)
- Management information systems
- Methods of data treatment
- Data aggregation, display, analysis, and interpretation
- Reporting information
- Use of evaluation data at the local level for program improvement

The Local Evaluation Assistance Unit and the eight Evaluation Improvement Program Regional Centers used these materials for both workshops and hands-on technical assistance with over 300 persons responsible for evaluating local programs. The participants included school staff with a wide range of program and evaluation responsibilities, Department staff, and faculty from colleges and universities. In addition to the participants shown in Chart VI-2, more than 50 persons refined their own evaluation study designs in one-day "hands-on" workshops, which were held at the Evaluation Improvement Program Regional Center offices. In addition, staff of the Local Evaluation Assistance Unit of OPER provided technical assistance to 18 LPAs that conducted one or more evaluation studies during the 1980-81.

The Local Evaluation Assistance Unit developed and used a "Review Document for Local Special Education Evaluation Plan" in two ways. First, it was used in providing technical assistance, and later, in reviewing 98 completed local evaluation plans containing 145 studies to be conducted during 1981-82. (See Appendices E and F.)

Local Evaluation Assistance Activities for 1981-82

Because of the need for technical assistance requested on the part of local agencies, the Local Evaluation Assistance Unit was planning the following activities for 1981-82:

1. Review and assist all 97 special education local plan areas (LPAs) to complete and implement their evaluation plans (evaluation studies) for 1981-82. This includes a final review and approval of local evaluation plans during October 1981.

2. Assist local agencies in the selection and/or development of appropriate data collection instruments and methods of data analysis, interpretation, and reporting for their use during 1981-82.

3. Continue the two-day workshops in conjunction with the eight Evaluation Improvement Program Regional Centers, emphasizing the use of evaluation information by local and state levels.

4. Sponsor regional symposia to discuss the findings of the local studies and local use of this information to answer questions of local concern and to improve programs.

5. Analyze and interpret local findings for the Department's 1981-82 annual evaluation report on the California Master Plan for Special Education.

6. Prepare a statewide plan to provide technical assistance to LPAs for 1982-83, including review of local evaluation plans with studies to be conducted during 1982-83.

CHART VI-2

SUMMARY OF PERSONNEL WHO ATTENDED OPER/EIP[1] WORKSHOPS FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM EVALUATION, DECEMBER, 1980, THROUGH MARCH, 1981

	Number who attended, by workshop sites								
PERSONNEL	Los Angeles	San Diego	San Mateo	Fresno	Orange	Sonoma	Shasta	Sac	TOTAL
Program Coordinator	12	9	10	10	4	8	9	10	72
Director of Special Ed.	5	6	6	8	3	5	9	12	54
OSE[2] Staff Person	2	1				2			5
Program Evaluator	5	4	2	1	1	1		2	16
Psychologist	5	4	5	4		2	4	5	29
Program Specialist	4	5	5	5	2	2	2	1	26
Assistant Superintendent	2			1				1	4
Consultant	6	2	2	1					11
Superintendent				4			1		5
Staff Development Coordinator	2			1		3			6
Teacher	2	2	2	3		4	3	2	18
Resource Specialist	2	1	3	2			4	6	18
Colleges/ Universities	2						1		3
TOTAL									267

[1] OPER refers to the Department's Office of Program Evaluation and Research. EIP refers to the Evaluation Improvement Program Regional Centers.

[2] OSE refers to the Department's Office of Special Education.

CHAPTER VII--WAS EVALUATION USED TO IMPROVE SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS?

Chapter VII answers the Department's final evaluation question for 1980-81, "Was evaluation used to improve special education programs?"

- Evaluation was used by the special education local plan areas (LPAs) and by the Department to improve special education programs during 1980-81 and to prepare for further improvements during 1981-82 and future years.

- Established special education LPAs made and proposed improvements in a wide variety of special education program aspects as a result of designing and conducting their own evaluation studies.

- Improvements included (1) making the community and school more aware and involved in special education programs; (2) ensuring the rights of children and parents; (3) developing individualized education programs; (4) providing staff development for regular and special education teachers; (5) measuring student progress; (6) locating high school programs for hearing impaired students; (7) arranging special transportation schedules; (8) improving parent knowledge of special education programs and participation in their children's education; and (9) strengthening local program evaluation capability.

- LPAs throughout California designed their local evaluation plans for 1981-82 to answer particular local evaluation questions and provide information for making local decisions for improving special education programs for handicapped students.

- The Department (1) answered statewide evaluation questions; (2) determined statewide trends; (3) demonstrated progress toward the goal of a full educational opportunity for handicapped students; (4) began to set up a statewide source of information about local evaluation studies; (5) improved its technical assistance and coordination functions in program evaluation for special education; and (6) designed its evaluation plan for special education programs in 1981-82, the first year of statewide implementation of the California Master Plan for Special Education in 97 LPAs.

Chapter VII contains background information on program evaluation in special education, findings on the use of evaluation to improve programs during 1980-81, statewide conclusions or trends over the period 1976-77 through 1980-81, and the Department's evaluation plan for 1981-82.

Program Evaluation in Special Education

Two of the major features of the California Master Plan for Special Education are the emphasis on the individual child who may need special education services and the continual and comprehensive evaluation of special education programs to make sure that the needs of individual children are known and met. Continual evaluation is the responsibility of the special education LPAs. Comprehensive evaluation is the responsibility of

the Department. Evaluation is intended to result in program improvement, not in complaining, criticism, or fault-finding.

During the development and implementation of the California Master Plan for Special Education over the past eleven years in California, a series of progressive changes have occurred in the perception, policy, and practice of program evaluation in special education. The perceptions started as negative reactions to the idea but have progressed to positive uses of evaluation information and of evaluation activities:

- "It can't be done, because each child is different."

- "We should have to evaluate a program only when it is a pilot program. After we've proved its worth, we don't have to evaluate anymore."

- "Program evaluation is something the Legislature wants, so we might as well promise to cooperate and write an evaluation report. But it won't help us--it's not our report. It's their report."

- "The Department's evaluation report does have some worth to us. We know how many children were served last year in special education programs in the Master Plan regions, even if we have only average daily attendance (a.d.a.) figures for most other special education programs in the rest of the state."

- "Evaluation is something the Department does to us at the local level, asking their questions and never answering our questions."

- "Evaluation is not only the Department coming in to evaluate us, but also the independent evaluator, two federally-funded contractors, three graduate students, and a visiting foreign scholar. That takes staff energy and time, interrupts student instruction time, and confuses parents. And we hardly ever get much useful information back in time to do anything."

- "Now we're supposed to evaluate our own programs, but our special education staff doesn't have much training in program evaluation and the evaluation staff doesn't know much about special education."

- "Evaluating our own programs gives us a chance to see how our programs are doing, and managing our own evaluation studies gives us a chance to ask and answer our own evaluation questions."

- "We can keep on doing what's working out well and put our attention on what needs to be improved."

Before the California Master Plan for Special Education, the policy of program evaluation in special education was implicit and limited. It was implicit in that there were no legal requirements for evaluating traditional ongoing categorical programs as authorized by state law and operated by districts or by offices of county superintendents of schools. It was limited in that the Department placed an evaluation requirement on locally

operated projects carried on as specially funded extensions or supplements to locally operated programs. One example was the use of discretionary federal funds administered by the Department under Title VI, Part B, "Assistance to States" of the Education of the Handicapped Act, Public Law 91-230, to fund competitive locally submitted project applications. Another example was the legislative provision for experimental programs in special education, which essentially permitted the Department to waive certain provisions of the Education Code for a limited number of local special education programs.

Program evaluation before the California Master Plan for Special Education was nearly nonexistent; and the evaluation that did exist was informal and intermittent. Although over 600 of the local districts operated at least one special education program, not one district had a local evaluation plan for evaluating and improving its special education program. In those relatively few districts with competitively awarded specially funded projects, evaluation was carried out for those projects alone, and it emphasized the documentation of project-funded activities more than the evaluation of the results. In addition, the Department did not evaluate programs on a statewide basis.

With the adoption of the Master Plan by the State Board of Education, the policy changed to explicit and universal. All special education LPAs were held responsible for evaluating their programs in terms of the growth and development of their children. The legislation has progressively emphasized the intent for the use of evaluation for program improvement.

The practices have been changing throughout California as new special education LPAs have been established and have begun implementing the California Master Plan for Special Education. During the early years, the Department evaluated local programs in response to specific legislative requirements. Over the years, the Department's Office of Program Evaluation and Research (OPER) has worked with each established, first-year implementer, and "planning" LPA to assist it in evaluating its own special education programs. (See Chapter VI for a description of Department activities in 1980-81.) The statewide emphasis has shifted from standard Department data collection for annual reporting to locally targeted studies whose results can be used twice: once for more immediate use in improving programs, and again, through re-analysis by the Department, to answer statewide evaluation questions.

Findings on the Use of Evaluation to Improve Programs in 1980-81

This section is divided into two parts, local uses and statewide uses.

Local Uses. Special education LPAs used the information from their own evaluation studies to answer their own local evaluation questions and to improve local special education services and processes in the program aspects they studied, such as staff development, parent participation in the decisions about their children, facilities, or transportation. Attention was focused on program areas of current interest and concern to local staff, parents, and community advisory committees.

In selecting the program evaluation questions for inquiry, each LPA determined its own program aspect or aspects of greatest local interest and concern. Local selection of a particular aspect meant that there was a local reason to conduct the study, and local intention to use the information. For example, one LPA selected implementation of IEPs and measurement of student performance. Another LPA chose communication about students at the critical points of change between elementary and secondary school sites.

In designing the evaluation studies, LPAs selected schools, programs, geographical areas, and types and ages of students according to local needs for evaluation information. For example, one LPA selected a high school in which a program for hearing-impaired students was located. LPAs used existing information or trained local staff in collecting new information, particularly as part of their daily tasks. For example, program specialists in one LPA examined student performance as part of the annual review of individual student progress.

LPAs broadened the range of kinds of persons who work with the schools, including community advisory committees, school site councils and graduate students in colleges and universities. For example, one LPA's community advisory committee developed a survey to send to parents. Another LPA worked with professors and graduate students from a local university and with parent facilitators.

LPAs analyzed, discussed, and interpreted their own information and examined the results of other studies, including their own studies in previous years. For example, one LPA has followed the progress of a sample of special education students over a three-year period. Another LPA compared the results, over three years, of its reviews of student records and the provision of instruction and services, as shown on students' IEPs. Another LPA compared its results on parent participation with two other externally conducted studies.

LPAs began to go beyond the completion and filing of an annual report to a continual process of program inquiry and improvement, providing progress reports and interim findings to local program managers and administrators. For example, one LPA conducted and completed ten evaluation studies, large and small, long and short. The LPA designed one-page flyers to show teachers the results of the studies to which they had contributed information.

LPAs investigated their own important findings with specific follow-up studies so that specific, rather than general, program improvements could be made. For example, one LPA surveyed a sample of parents of handicapped children who were receiving special education services and found general satisfaction, except for the area of special transportation, where parents of children in special classes expressed some dissatisfaction. The LPA followed up its finding by surveying each parent whose child went to school on the special buses. The results showed great satisfaction with the bus service: drivers, courtesy, on-time, children liked it, and so forth. One exception, however, was the length of time some of the children were on the bus. The LPA and the bus company rearranged the bus routes and schedules to shorten the time spent in riding.

Based on information from a sample of its resource specialists, one LPA was able to estimate the number of person-days required for health and psychological screening for students remaining in the resource specialist program.

Other program areas in which improvements were made or proposed included (1) allocation of staff; (2) location of programs for hearing-impaired high school students; (3) in-service training of all kinds; (4) corrective actions to change programs to match the spirit and intent of the Master Plan as well as the letter of the law and regulations; (5) reduction of paperwork burdens; (6) commendations to encourage continuance of worthwhile program practices; (7) use of parent facilitators to talk with other parents; and (8) the use of locally developed informative brochures on the educational opportunities for their children.

Statewide uses. The Department used its knowledge of, and its experience in evaluating, special education programs throughout the year. The Department had designed its evaluation plan to take advantage of the information which would be available from LPA evaluation studies in areas of statewide concern. At the same time, the Department provided technical assistance to LPAs in using existing information and, thereby, reducing duplication of evaluation efforts.

The Department used evaluation to answer perennial evaluation questions and to create a statewide picture of special education programs in 1980-81. The Department noted statewide trends, both positive and negative in program operation as related to progress toward California's goal of full educational opportunity for each child who may need special education services. Through its analysis of local evaluation studies, the Department was able to demonstrate efficiency and timeliness of local studies, to recognize work of local evaluators, to commend local school boards and directors of special education programs, to provide a source of information about local and state evaluation efforts, and to give feedback to contributing LPAs and Evaluation Improvement Program Regional Centers.

In addition to answering perennial evaluation questions, the Department used evaluation information from current and previous years in preparing its responses to questions (and allegations) about special education programs.

Going beyond the letter of the law, past fulfilling the reporting requirements, and addressing the intent for comprehensive evaluation, the Department has suggested areas in which program improvements are needed or in which policy or legislative changes may be needed at state or federal levels.

Statewide Conclusions and/or Trends From 1976-77 Through 1980-81

- The willingness and capability of special education LPAs to conduct their own evaluation studies have increased remarkably.

- Local evaluation information is used locally to improve programs.

- The Department of Education is able to use local evaluation information in its statewide program evaluation.

Department Evaluation Plan for 1981-82

In designing its statewide evaluation plan for 1981-82, the Department has examined the 97 local evaluation plans for 1981-82 and intends to continue its technical assistance efforts to help ensure that the local evaluation studies will yield timely, accurate, believable, and useful results at both local and state levels of special education programs. In addition, regional seminars will be organized so that LPAs can share their findings and their use of evaluation information to improve their programs.

The Department's statewide evaluation plan for 1981-82 is cooperative, coordinated, and efficient.

- Statewide. All 97 special education local plan areas are participating, with 145 local evaluation studies planned and being conducted. (See Appendix F.)

- Cooperative. Local plan areas and the Department are working together to obtain useful information for program improvement.

- Coordinated. The Department provides technical assistance to local agency staff and reviews proposed local evaluation plans and studies.

- Efficient. Local studies focus on topics of immediate local concern. The results are used at least twice: locally, to improve programs; and statewide, to share results and to help create a statewide picture of special education programs.

APPENDIX A

LIST OF EIGHTEEN ESTABLISHED SPECIAL EDUCATION LOCAL PLAN AREAS CONDUCTING EVALUATION STUDIES OF THEIR SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS ACCORDING TO THEIR OWN EVALUATION PLANS DURING 1980-81

Contra Costa County
Fresno Unified School District
Glenn County
Humboldt County and Del Norte County
Los Angeles Unified School District
Merced County
Orange Unified School District
Riverside County
Sacramento City Unified School District
San Diego City Unified School District
San Juan Unified School District
Santa Barbara County
Santa Clara County, Zone II
Santa Clara County, Zones I, III, IV, V, and VI
Stanislaus County
West Orange County Consortium for Special Education
West End San Bernardino County Consortium for Special Education
Whittier Area Cooperative for Special Education

NOTE: Findings from evaluation studies from these Special Education Local Plan Areas have been analyzed, interpreted, and summarized for this Annual Evaluation Report.

APPENDIX B

LIST OF EIGHT EVALUATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM REGIONAL CENTERS PROVIDING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE IN PROGRAM EVALUATION FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION

Fresno County
Los Angeles County
Orange County
Sacramento County
San Diego County
San Mateo County
Shasta County
Sonoma County

APPENDIX C

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATION REQUIRING THIS REPORT

*56600. It is the intent of the Legislature to provide for ongoing comprehensive evaluation of special education programs authorized by this part. The Legislature finds and declares that the evaluation of these programs shall be designed to provide the Legislature, the State Board of Education, the Department of Education, and program administrators at county, district, and school levels with the information necessary to refine and improve policies, regulations, guidelines, and procedures on a continuing basis, and to assess the overall merits of these efforts.

56602. In accordance with a program evaluation plan adopted pursuant to subdivision (e) of Section 56100, the superintendent shall submit to the board, the Legislature, and the Governor, an annual evaluation of the special education programs implemented under this part. This evaluation shall:

(a) Utilize existing information sources including fiscal records, child counts, other descriptive data, and program reviews to gather ongoing information regarding implementation of programs authorized by this chapter.

(b) Utilize existing information to the maximum extent feasible to conduct special evaluation studies of issues of statewide concern. Such studies may include, but need not be limited to, all of the following: (1) Pupil performance; (2) Placement of pupils in least restrictive environments; (3) Degree to which services identified in individualized education programs are provided; (4) Parent, pupil, teacher, program specialist, resource specialist, and administrator attitudes toward services and processes provided; (5) Program costs, including, but not limited to: (A) Expenditures for instructional personnel services, support services, special transportation services, and regionalized services; (B) Capital outlay costs at the district and school levels, and for special education services regions, county offices, state special schools, and nonpublic, nonsectarian schools; (C) Funding sources at the district, special education services region, county office, state special school, and nonpublic, nonsectarian school levels; (c) Summarize and report on the results of special studies regarding the Master Plan for Special Education performed pursuant to Section 33406.

(d) Identify the numbers of individuals with exceptional needs, their racial and ethnic data, their classification by designated instructional services, resource specialist, special day class or center, and nonpublic, nonsectarian schools, in accordance with criteria established by the board and consistent with federal reporting requirements.

56603. The Department of Education shall, as part of the annual evaluation, report the information necessary to refine and improve statewide policies, regulations, guidelines, and procedures developed pursuant to this part.

---

*These Education Code provisions were enacted by Chapter 797 and Chapter 1353, Statutes of 1980.

APPENDIX D

METHODS USED BY SPECIAL EDUCATION LOCAL PLAN AREAS (LPAs) IN 1980-81 IN THEIR EVALUATION STUDIES

The special education local plan areas (LPAs) designed their evaluation studies to use existing data and capitalize on program operations, such as annual reviews of student progress, wherever possible.

The evaluation specialists in the LPAs developed their designs, including their data collection methods and instruments, and tips on conducting evaluation studies in a cost-effective and positive way, with technical assistance from the staff of the Local Evaluation Assistance Unit of the Department's Office of Program Evaluation and Research. These staff were responsible for reviewing the local evaluation plans and proposed evaluation studies as well as for providing technical assistance. The technical assistance was aimed at designing feasible, workable, approvable usable studies, not at directing the selection of the topics or local evaluation questions.

The LPA evaluators' primary aim was to answer local evaluation questions by producing information which would be accurate, meaningful, and usable locally. A secondary aim was to produce information which the Department could collect, interpret, and use for statewide evaluation of special education programs; for example, in this annual evaluation report.

The LPAs used a great variety of data collection methods and instruments, which were selected, adapted, or created to fit the LPA, the local evaluation question, and the persons who would provide or collect the data. In collecting the data for their local education studies during 1980-81, the 18 LPAs:

- Examined 3,101 students' records; 4,396 individualized education programs (IEPs); and test scores for 4,107 students.
- Visited 246 school sites and 328 homes of parents of special education students.
- Observed 87 classrooms and 36 IEP team meetings.
- Surveyed 2,751 school staff members, 1,061 parents, and 47 students.
- Interviewed 168 school staff members, 1,523 parents, and 149 students.
- Examined program records representing 52,532 students and staff.
- Examined reactions to in-service workshops of 1,134 persons, including parents, school staff, students, and community persons.

Training of data collectors was particularly important before the data were collected, whether the task was making visits to schools; interviewing parents, teachers, and students (including working with interpreters for hearing-impaired, or for speakers of languages other than English when the data collector did not speak that language); reviewing student records; administering standardized tests; observing classrooms; or playing a participant-observer role in IEP meetings.

The local study designs called for the participation of students, parents, teachers, and administrators on school sites and in communities. This participation took several forms: selecting evaluation questions, collecting data, providing data, interpreting the results, using the results to improve programs, and planning follow-up studies.

The LPAs collected their data for their evaluation studies in three broad ways: examination of existing information, collection of new information, and comparison of the results of their local evaluation studies with the results of other studies where appropriate. Table M (for Methods) displays the methods used and the number of LPAs using each method during 1980-81.

TABLE M

METHODS USED BY SPECIAL EDUCATION LOCAL PLAN AREAS (LPAs)
IN THEIR LOCAL EVALUATION STUDIES DURING 1980-81

Method	Number of LPAs using method
1. Examination of existing program and student records	16
- Tabulations from program files (by hand or computer-generated)	
- Referrals	1
- Notices and responses from parents	5
- IEP team meetings	1
- IEP information	
- Services to be provided to students/teachers	8
- Objectives to be achieved by students	
- At school	8
- At home	1
- Progress toward meeting objectives	8
- Length of time receiving service	2
- Proficiency standards	1
- Grade-level changes: promotion, retention, graduation	3
- Secondary students	
- Career/vocational education	1
- Graduation standards	1
- Teacher case-load lists of students being taught (enrollment and staffing data)	9

Method	Number of LPAs using method
2. Examination of newly-gathered program and student data	16
- Ratings of attainment of individual student objectives at time of annual review of student progress	2
- Participant-observer techniques in group meetings	3
- School site visits	10
- Classroom observation	5
- IEP team observation	2
- Interviews, alone or in groups, in person or on telephone, with and without interpreters	9
- Handout and mailout written surveys or questionnaires	13
- Administration of regionwide standardized achievement tests	2
- Teacher analysis of class assignments	4
- Observation of student performance over a period of time	11
- Teacher-made tests and quizzes	11
- Curriculum-related tests	11
- Weekly checklists of progress	1
3. Comparison with data from other studies	8
- Locally conducted (includes theses for Master's Degree, early retiree projects, previous studies)	6
- Externally conducted of local programs	3
- Conducted in other programs and reported in the literature	1

Through such statewide groups as the California Special Education Evaluators, at program evaluation workshops sponsored by the Department and the Evaluation Improvement Program Regional Centers, and through ordinary, continual professional interchange, the evaluators shared their experiences, their methods, and the program improvments recommended or put into place as a result of their evaluation studies.

Reviewer

LPA

Date

APPENDIX E

Office of Program Evaluation and Research (OPER) Review Document
for Local Special Education Evaluation Plan
1981-82

1. Special Study	Yes/ No	Comments
a. Is there a plan for a special study in one or more of the following areas: - Pupil performance? - Placement of pupils in least restrictive environments? - Degree to which services identified in IEPs are provided? - Parent, pupil, administrator, teacher, program specialist, and resources specialist attitudes toward services and processes provided? - Cost effectiveness?		
b. Is the study based on a local evaluation question?		
c. Is the local evaluation question included in the description of the study?		
d. Does the description specify who is responsible for conducting the study?		

1. Special Study (continued)	Yes/ No	Comments
e. Does the description of the study include: - Method (pretest, post-test, time series, etc.)? - Instruments (achievement tests, surveys, interviews, records, MIS forms, etc.)? - Plan for collecting information (who, how, when, etc.)? - Data analysis? - Possible uses of the information? - Reporting of information?		

2. Pupil Count	Yes/ No	Comments
a. Are the following data elements included in the student recordkeeping system: - Pupils by handicap (by age)? - Placement of pupils by instructional setting specified on IEP? - Movement of pupils between instructional settings? - Ethnicity?		

2. Pupil Count (continued)	Yes/ No	Comments
b. Are local enumerative data elements listed to answer local questions?		
c. Is the method for collecting and reporting the enumerative information described?		
d. Will the collection method produce an unduplicated count for all pupils served in special education during an annual reporting period including:		
- Handicapping condition (minimum of 11 conditions)?		
- Four instructional settings?		
- Movement of pupils between instructional settings and out of special education?		
- Ethnicity?		

3. Management Plan	Yes/ No	Comments
a. Is there a management plan for conducting the LPA's evaluation?		
b. Does the management plan include:		
- Assigned local staff person or outside evaluators?		
- Number of days assigned?		
- Budget?		
- Time line for activities?		

APPENDIX F

LOCAL EVALUATION STUDIES FOR 1981-82 IN
FIVE TOPIC AREAS OF STATEWIDE INTEREST

During 1981-82, a total of 145 local evaluation studies will be conducted by the 97 Special Education Local Plan Areas. Each study addresses one of the five topics of statewide interest, as contained in Education Code Section 56602(b): provision of special education services according to individualized education programs (IEPs), placement in least restrictive environment, student performance, attitudes toward special education services, and program costs. The studies are listed below according to the five topics. Further information on the studies may be obtained from the Local Evaluation Assistance Unit in the Department's Office of Program Evaluation and Research.

I. Local Evaluation Studies in "Provision of Special Education Services according to Individualized Education Programs"

Extent and quality of the IEPs being implemented.

Are all eligible pupils placed by the juvenile court system receiving all services, as outlined by the IEP?

Do all pupils in resource specialist programs have IEPs on file in schools of placement?

Effectiveness of criteria for placement of pupils in designated instruction and services.

What is the degree and quality of service provided, as identified on the IEP?

Management information system study of class size and pupil admission/exit flow.

Catalog of activities performed by resource specialist program teacher.

Does the management information system provide timely, relevant, and accurate pupil information?

What are parents interested in knowing about special education? How to deal with your child's development at home; legal rights and your child; communications between home and school; awareness and IEPs.

Relationship between the local vocational education curricula and competencies to competencies required by community employers.

With the revised governance model, is there any change in the program director's role and function?

Has the child intervention team made a difference in pupil referral or placements?

What is the ratio of pupil referrals to placement as a result of the new eligibility criteria for learning handicapped pupils?

How well acquainted are the resource specialist program teachers and parents of all pupils with the IEPs? With the due process procedures?

Have complaints and "fair hearings" increased or decreased? Why?

What is the quality and relationship of first-stated differentiated objectives to specific goals in pupils' IEPs?

Is there an observable difference in the quality of objectives written by fully credentialed teachers and those written by preliminary teachers or by staff with waivers?

What are the factors related to the successful integration of severely handicapped, physically handicapped, or communicatively handicapped students? In what classes/subjects, for how long, and with what results are these students integrated?

What services is the resource specialist providing for student and teachers at the local school site?

What improvements or reductions in service are noted by parents of students placed in special education prior to local implementation of the California Master Plan?

What are the monthly changes in enrollment, service proportions, and in staffing ratios?

Is there any difference in programs between school level? What areas of the program need improvement at the secondary level?

How adequate was the psycho-educational assessment of pupils?

Does the management information system provide timely, relevant, and accurate information to assist the management of special education programs?

How effective is the program management system in providing special education services, and what changes should be made for improvement?

What is the level, adequacy, and quality of in-service training?

How effective has the special educator/parent facilitator program been?

To what degree are IEPs being implemented?

Evaluate the current criteria used to place pupils in the resource specialist program and special day classes.

Examine the assessment, placement, and re-assessment of special education pupils.

Does the scheduling of daily activities differ among resource specialist teachers?

Degree to which services identified in the IEP are provided.

Examine the time-use difference between the itinerant and single site resource specialist at the elementary level.

Examine the need for special therapy services at all levels. Examine the effect of these services on pupils who have received these services.

What effect do eligibility criteria have upon identification and placement of students in special day classes?

What types of regular classroom modifications were attempted and what impact can be demonstrated on children before placement in special education?

Implementation of services and quality of IEPs.

Is further inservice training needed in the area of IEP writing?

Examine IEPs in relationship to educational need and actual classroom instruction.

Determine whether the services contained in the IEPs are provided.

What is the quality and effectiveness of IEPs?

Which children are referred to special education and why?

Identification of factors which promote for successful integration of severely handicapped pupils into the regular school setting.

Examine the cycle of services provided to special education pupils.

How did the increase in resource specialist program case load affect the quality of pupil services, communication between parents-program, and other program personnel?

Degree to which services identified in the IEP were provided.

How do parents perceive special education services their child is receiving? How do they perceive communications between parent-program?

Degree to which services in the IEP are provided.

To what degree are parents aware and/or informed about special education services being received by their children? To what degree are parents satisfied with special services being received by their children?

II. Local Evaluation Studies in "Placement in Least Restrictive Environment"

What are the criteri, for placement of pupils in special day class and resource specialist programs for the learning handicapped? Are there common operational entrance criteria that teachers, administrators, parents, agency representatives, or IEP teams are using throughout the county, and if so, what are they?

Did the perception of teacher ability to carry out Master Plan functions change as a result of in-service training?

Did the ability to interact between special and regular pupils change as a result of self-help instruction in regular school activities?

Did the ability of regular and special teachers to improve pupil behavior change as a result of inservice training on assertive discipline?

What are the outcomes of special education staff training?

Efficiency of moving pupils out of special education and back into the regular program.

Examine the placement of pupils in the resource specialist program as compared to special day classes.

Do elementary and secondary school districts have an advantage in mainstreaming special education pupils as compared to a unified school district?

Management information system study of pupil integration by subject area.

What areas of inservice do special education teachers need to facilitate services to special education pupils, parents and regular teachers?

How effective are the placement procedures for enrolling special education pupils in the least restrictive environment, including referral and assessment?

What is the status of pupil movement between settings, and what factors/and or common behaviors weigh heaviest in those movements?

Does integration time increase proportionately as students are in programs longer, become older, or are in less restrictive placements?

How well are the revised specific learning disabilities applied, and what effects are noted in enrollment/placement compared with 1980-81?

Is the elementary resource specialist program an effective model to increase pupil participation in the regular education program? What variables enhance or prevent this participation?

What amount of time, type, and quality of activities are learning handicapped pupils from special day classes receiving in the regular education program?

Which pupils are placed in the least restrictive environment and when changing programs, do they move to a more or less restrictive environment?

What is the difference in percent of special class pupils who have moved to a less restrictive environment between 1980-81 and 1981-82?

III. Local Evaluation Studies in "Student Performance"

A comparison of learning tasks of trainable mentally retarded pupils to regular pupils to determine if the tasks can be differentially structured.

How much growth was made by pupils in reading in the special classes for the severely language disordered?

What level of skills in reading, math and composition do elementary school learning handicapped pupils in resource specialist programs demonstrate at the end of 1981-82 school year?

What percent of secondary school learning handicapped pupils in resource specialist programs pass the local proficiency tests in reading, math and composition in the 1981-82 year?

What is the math achievement of learning handicapped special day class pupils whose IEPs contain a math objective?

What is the relationship of achievement in reading and math by resource specialist program pupils to time spent in the regular program?

Are career and vocational goals and objectives contained in the IEPs met?

Are proficiency standards, either regular or alternative, specified in the IEP for special education high school seniors, and are the goals in the IEP related to these standards? When there are alternative standards are they related to the maximum pupil expectancy and pupil performance?

What is the movement of special education pupils within special education: is the direction back to the regular program?

What variables is the resource specialist program are most important toward pupil achievement?

What achievement is noted for students placed in special day classes in 1978 and 1979 who, in 1981-82:

a. remain in special day class,
b. transfer to the resource specialist program, or
c. return to regular school program?

What differential standards are set by IEP teams for high school special education students who are unable to meet the district graduation standards?

What are the factors correlated to pupil performance?

What is the cause of achievement decline of pupils when they move to a higher level?

What percent of special education pupils will meet what percent of their objectives in the IEP?

What is the growth of resource specialist program pupils in the areas of math, reading, and spelling?

What is the success of pupils who were in special day classes for aphasic children in 1980-81 and transferred to a less restrictive environment in 1981-82?

Academic success of pupils in resource specialist programs and in special day classes.

Academic progress of resource specialist program pupils.

Attainment of pupil objectives as specified on the IEP.

There are no differences in academic growth in reading and math between resource specialist program pupils and special day class pupils.

What changes in student performance occur when the program is changed from a pull-out to a resource specialist model?

Is the special education program improving academic achievement and successful integration for special day class pupils with an average to high academic expectancy?

Academic achievement of all special education pupils.

How well are the reading objectives written, rated as being met, and why are they being met or not?

Academic achievement in math and reading of pupils on all levels, by length of time in the resource specialist program.

Did the ability of learning handicapped pupils to decode words improve?

What is the rate of attainment of the objectives contained in the IEP?

Nonbiased assessment for Hispanic pupils?

The degree to which short term objectives are achieved.

Reading and math retention as a result of summer school experience.

How successful are pupils in attaining specific IEP objectives in math, reading, language, career education, social adjustment, and psycho-perceptual?

How long does a pupil remain in special education?

How does length of participation in special day class affect the reading and math performance of learning handicapped pupils?

IV. Local Evaluation Studies in "Attitudes Toward Special Education Services"

Awareness, involvement, and satisfaction of parents with special education.

How special education services are perceived?

Are parents of special education pupils satisfied with the services their children are receiving?

Examine the attitudes of regular classroom teachers toward special day class pupils integrated into their classes.

Examine the perceptions and knowledge of regular teachers who have special day class pupils in their classrooms.

Attitudes towards services provided.

Did the attitude of resource specialists towards their role and their responsibilities towards the assessment and placement of pupils change as a result of in-service training?

Attitudes of regular and special education teachers toward services provided learning handicapped pupils in resource specialist programs, according to district size and grade level.

Parent attitude toward services and processes provided.

What are attitudes of parents, regular teachers, administrators, students and resource specialists towards services provided by the resource specialist program?

Do the differences in scheduling of daily activities affect the attitudes toward resource specialist programs at each school site?

What changes in attitudes occur when the program is changed from a pull-out to a resource specialist program?

Parent satisfaction with resource specialist and special day class services.

Determine the changes in knowledge and attitudes of regular and special education staff towards the Master Plan after its first year of implementation.

What are the opinions of parents of special education pupils, regular education teachers, and other personnel involved in the IEP process toward special education services?

Identification of the critical components of the resource specialist program and the assessment of attitudes toward these services.

What are the attitudes of regular teachers toward mainstreaming?

What are teachers' attitudes toward mainstreaming after a year of in-service training?

Do principals and special education teachers see the new role of the program specialists as conducive in improving instruction in special education programs?

What is the impact of Senate Bill 769 program changes on the quality of program services as perceived by resource specialist teachers and local directors and coordinators?

What are the results of past and most recent staff development activities as perceived by resource specialist teachers?

Attitudes of parents, staff, and pupils toward services provided.

Differences between attitudes of special education parents when communication is organized and when it isn't.

Do resource specialists perceive that they are receiving adequate information from the child study and IEP teams?

Are regular teachers perceiving they have an active role in the IEP process?

Are communication processes between educators and parents of handicapped pupils effective?

To what extent is integration taking place, and what are the positive and negative features of integration?

How satisfied are parents of students assigned to schools outside their neighborhood with the placement, programs, and services, including transportation?

Are site administrators satisfied with student placements and the delivery of special education programs and services?

How accurate is the information entered in the management information system?

What are the effects on staff of the reduction in program specialist staff?

What would be the effects of elimination of the resource specialist program?

Determine the effectiveness of a county plan for changing attitudes and understanding all of staff.

What are parent perceptions of their role in the development of their child's IEP?

Teacher attitudes towards services and processes provided.

Attitudes of resource specialist teachers and parents toward the least restrictive environment and alternate modes of service delivery.

Do regular teachers perceive that they receive adequate information from the IEP team in regard to mainstreamed pupils?

What are the attitudes of special and regular education teachers toward the resource specialist program?

V. Local Evaluation Studies in "Program Costs"

The efficiency, economy, effectiveness and safety of the special education transportation operation system, including costs.

An analysis of the present transportation system, including costs for pupils to receive centralized services.

What are the actual program costs of running the special education programs?

Review of program costs for 3-year period in relationship to per pupil costs for all programs, including transportation.

LR81-01 DE 12717 6-82 700